

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 and under 35 U.S.C. §112. The drawings have been objected to. Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29 have been amended. Claim 30 has been added. No matter has been added. Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings due to lack of legends. Applicant proposes amendment of the drawings as shown in the drawings attached hereto. Upon approval of the drawing amendments by the Examiner, Applicant will submit formal drawings incorporating the amendments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, in an effort to clarify embodiments of Applicant's invention and pass the claims to allowance at an earliest possible date, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29. In addition, Applicant has added Claim 30.

As amended, Claim 1 recites a method for provisioning resources of a plurality of organizations using a server, each organization having resources internal to the organization, the method comprising the steps of: configuring the server with a set of organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles for each organization; defining a plurality of resource provisioning policies for each organization based on selected organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles; receiving, at the server, organizational attribute information, organizational information, and user role information from each organization for a particular user, resource internal to the organization, or database; configuring the server to apply the resource provisioning policies to the user based on the received user role information, organizational information, and organizational attribute information; configuring the server to

provision resources internal to the organization from a remote, centralized location based on the applied resource provisioning policies; and configuring the server to implement a recovery procedure when at least one of the policies is violated. Claims 6, 15 and 29 recite similar features. These claims now distinguish between features which are performed by a computer and features which are performed externally. Moreover, the invention of each of Claims 1, 6, 15 and 29, as amended, is described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1, 6 and 15 now recite that a server computer is configured with, *inter alia*, with a set of organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles for each organization; is configured to apply resource provisioning policies to users based on the received user role information, organizational information, and organizational attribute information; and is configured to provision resources internal to the organization from a remote, centralized location based on the applied resource provisioning policies. Receiving a plurality of resource provisioning policies is not recited in the context of a computer or a server. In addition, these claims also recite that a server computer is configured to implement a recovery procedure when at least one of the policies is violated. Claim 29 recites similar feature.

The foregoing amendments find support in the specification as originally filed at a variety of places including, *inter alia*, page 29, line 5 to page 37, line 13; Figures 7A-7E; and page 16, line 25 to page 17, line 10.

While the Examiner asserts that the specification fails to disclose programmable steps or programmable flow for each of the method steps recited in the independent claims, Applicant respectfully asserts that, as amended, the steps shown in Claims 1, 6 and 15 are fully supported in the specification as noted above. For example, although Figures 7A-7E do not depict program flow using flow chart symbols, these drawings do depict program flow in an enterprise scheduling context. As can be seen in the embodiment of the invention shown in Figure 7A, the first steps involved in provisioning a user with resources are to request credentials from and authenticate a user upon initiation of a login request. As can be seen in the embodiment of the invention shown in Figure 7E, the last steps involved in provisioning a user

with resources are to provision a service, confirm the provision and add a service account. Details of these programmable flow charts are explained in the written description as noted above.

In addition, the Examiner has requested that Applicant identify the definition of “organizational attributes” and “organizational information” in the specification. Applicant has not assigned any special meaning to these terms. Accordingly, the terms “attributes” and “information” may be given the ordinary and customary meaning in the context of an organization or enterprise. For example, Merriam Webster’s on-line dictionary at www.m-w.com defines the word attribute as “an inherent characteristic,” while the word information is defined at the same web site as “knowledge obtained from investigation, study, or instruction.”

The Examiner has also requested that Applicant further identify the components recited in Claims 16, 20 and 29. The components recited in Claims 16, 20 and 29 may be found in the specification as originally filed at, *inter alia*, page 9, line 17 to page 27, line 4; Figures 1-4. For example, in Claim 16, a third party resource provisioning manager is described generally at page 9, lines 19-20; a server for provisioning resources is shown generally in Figure 1, element 10; resources belonging to each organization are shown generally in Figure 4, elements 26, 66; and a network providing a link between the server and the resources is described generally at page 9, line 21 to page 10, line 18.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admitted prior art in view of Lumelsky, U.S. Patent No. 6,460,082. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, in an effort to clarify embodiments of Applicant’s invention and pass the claims to allowance at an earliest possible date, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29.

As stated above, as amended claim 1 recites a method for provisioning resources of a plurality of organizations using a server, each organization having resources internal to the organization, the method comprising the steps of: configuring the server with a set of

organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles for each organization; defining a plurality of resource provisioning policies for each organization based on selected organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles; receiving, at the server, organizational attribute information, organizational information, and user role information from each organization for a particular user, resource internal to the organization, or database; configuring the server to apply the resource provisioning policies to the user based on the received user role information, organizational information, and organizational attribute information; configuring the server to provision resources internal to the organization from a remote, centralized location based on the applied resource provisioning policies; and configuring the server to implement a recovery procedure when at least one of the policies is violated. Claims 6, 15 and 29 recite similar features.

Moreover, Claim 16 has been amended to recite a system for provisioning resources internal to a plurality of organizations, the system comprising: a third party resource provisioning manager; a server for provisioning resources, wherein the server is operated by a third party resource provisioning manager, the server configured with a plurality of resource provisioning policies for each organization based on selected organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles; resources belonging to each organization, the resources being internal to the organization; and a network providing a link between the server and the resources, wherein the server is configured to automatically provision the resources based on the policies. Claim 20 recites similar features. The features recited in amended Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29 are not disclosed, individually or in combination, in Applicant's admitted prior art or Lumelsky.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Applicant notes that RBAC is one form of automatic provisioning. However, nowhere does Applicant admit that recovery procedures are implemented when a policy is violated, as recited in amended Claims 1, 6, 15 and 29. In addition, nowhere does Applicant admit that resources are automatically provisioned based on policies, as recited in amended Claims 16 and 20.

Moreover, Lumelsky does not make up for the deficiencies of Applicant's admitted prior art. Lumelsky is directed toward a system and method for managing resources for provisioning media services in Internet utility environments for the delivery of multi media content. In Lumelsky, the resources managed are multi media resources (see Lumelsky, column 5, lines 5-8). Moreover, in Lumelsky, resources are provisioned based on attributes of the resource itself, not attributes of the organization or roles of users of the resources. (See Lumelsky, column 8, lines 39-47.) There is no disclosure or suggestion in Lumelsky of configuring a server to implement a recovery procedure when at least one policy is violated, as recited in amended Claims 1, 6, 15 and 29, or to automatically provision resources based on the policies as recited in amended Claims 16 and 20.

Because there are features in Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29 that are not disclosed or suggested in either Applicant's admitted prior art or Lumelsky, the combination of Applicant's admitted prior art and Lumelsky cannot recite all of the features of these claims. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be made against Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29, and the claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, using these references.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumelsky, U.S. Patent No. 6,460,082, in view of Schneider, U.S. Patent No. 6,408,336. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, as stated above, in an effort to clarify embodiments of Applicant's invention and pass the claims to allowance at an earliest possible date, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29.

As stated above, as amended claim 1 recites a method for provisioning resources of a plurality of organizations using a server, each organization having resources internal to the organization, the method comprising the steps of: configuring the server with a set of organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles for each organization; defining a plurality of resource provisioning policies for each organization based on selected organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles; receiving, at the server, organizational attribute information, organizational information, and user role information from each organization for a particular user, resource internal to the organization, or database;

configuring the server to apply the resource provisioning policies to the user based on the received user role information, organizational information, and organizational attribute information; configuring the server to provision resources internal to the organization from a remote, centralized location based on the applied resource provisioning policies; and configuring the server to implement a recovery procedure when at least one of the policies is violated. Claims 6, 15 and 29 recite similar features.

Moreover, Claim 16 has been amended to recite a system for provisioning resources internal to a plurality of organizations, the system comprising: a third party resource provisioning manager; a server for provisioning resources, wherein the server is operated by a third party resource provisioning manager, the server configured with a plurality of resource provisioning policies for each organization based on selected organizational attributes, organizational information, and user roles; resources belonging to each organization, the resources being internal to the organization; and a network providing a link between the server and the resources, wherein the server is configured to automatically provision the resources based on the policies. Claim 20 recites similar features. The features recited in amended Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29 are not disclosed, individually or in combination, in Lumelsky or Schneider.

Lumelsky is directed toward a system and method for managing resources for provisioning media services in Internet utility environments for the delivery of multi media content. In Lumelsky, the resources managed are multi media resources (see Lumelsky, column 5, lines 5-8). Moreover, in Lumelsky, resources are provisioned based on attributes of the resource itself, not attributes of the organization or roles of users of the resources. (See Lumelsky, column 8, lines 39-47.) There is no disclosure or suggestion in Lumelsky of configuring a server to implement a recovery procedure when at least one policy is violated, as recited in amended Claims 1, 6, 15 and 29, or to automatically provision resources based on the policies as recited in amended Claims 16 and 20.

Schneider does not make up for the deficiencies of Lumelsky. Schneider is directed toward the control of access to data in a distributed environment. In Schneider, the policies are defined simply to determine whether or not a particular user has access to a particular

database or resource. (See Schneider, column 9, lines 52-56.) There is no disclosure or suggestion in Schneider of configuring a server to implement a recovery procedure when at least one policy is violated, as recited in amended Claims 1, 6, 15 and 29, or to automatically provision resources based on the policies as recited in amended Claims 16 and 20.

Because there are features in Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29 that are not disclosed or suggested in either Lumelsky or Schneider, the combination of Lumelsky and Schneider cannot recite all of the features of these claims. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be made against Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 20 and 29, and the claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, using these references.

Added Claim

Applicant has added Claim 30. Support for Claim 30 may be found in the specification as originally filed at, *inter alia*, Figures 1-3 and pages 16, line 26 to page 17, line 10. No new matter has been added. Claim 30 is believed to be allowable over the art cited by the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7-16-04

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23392
Telephone: (310) 975-7963
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

By 

Irvin C. Harrington, III
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,740